REMARKS

This response is to the official action mailed in the above-referenced case on October 29, 2007. Claims 1-22 are cancelled and claims 23-46 are added as new claims for examination.

Examiner's objection to the Abstract:

The examiner has objected to the Abstract, kindly providing requirements and suggestions for a proper Abstract.

Applicant's response:

The applicant has deleted the current abstract and has provided by amendment above a new Abstract conforming to the requirements.

Examiner's objection to multiple-dependent claims:

The examiner has objected to claims 18-22 because of multiple dependency.

Applicant's response:

All of the as-filed claims have been cancelled and all new claims are presented for examination, and there are no multiple dependencies in the new claims presented.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112:

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 6 and 16 under 35 U.S.C.§ 112, second paragraph as being indefinite.

Applicant's response:

The applicant has cancelled claims 1-22, rendering the § rejection moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101:

The examiner has rejected claims 19-22 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant's response:

The applicant has cancelled claims 1-22, and new method claim 37 recites a method executing from a digital storage media on a computing appliance, and is statutory under the present guidelines. Depended claims 38-48 are therefore statutory as well.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections:

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 15 and 19 as being anticipated by Chigier, US 5638487, hereinafter Chigier.

Applicant's response:

Again claims 1-22 have been cancelled, and new claims presented, but Chigier deserves to be dealt with relative to the new claims.

The examiner rejects claim 1 relying on Chigier col. 4 lines 25-35, saying that Chigier describes an extractor that assigns concepts to the speech being processes. In the passage cited by the examiner Chigier assigns a future vector sequence to input speech. The vector sequence is not a meaning for the words and phrases as in the present invention as claimed. Chigier, as described in the Abstract of Chigier, is all about boundary probabilities for ascertaining separation between words in speech recognition, and has nothing at all to do with assigning meaning to parts of input speech, as in the present invention. Chigier simply does not apply. The present invention, as claimed in new claim 23, operates like a human mind, in that a word, once recognized, is used in concert with a knowledge base, to assign a meaning for the word. The word can be text or audio, and may be in any language, as long as the knowledge base encompasses the word and the extractor can find a meaning/concept match for the word. Once the meanings are assigned, the connector links the

concepts, and the resulting statement id used for a variety of purposes.

35 U.S.C. § 103 rejections:

The examiner applies § 103 rejections using Chigier as a primary reference. As Chigier has no teaching whatever relative to providing a concept or lexical meaning for a word or phrase, and linking the concepts, nor do any of the four other references applied, nor do any of the references cited but not applied, claims 23 and 37 are clearly patentable over all of the references taken singly or in any combination.

As independent claims 23 and 37 are clearly patentable, depended claims 24-36 and 38-48 are patentable at least as depended from a patentable claim.

As all of the claims are shown to be patentable over the art, it is respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered, the claims be allowed, and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted,
Bernd Schonebeck

By *[Donald R. Boys]*
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755